

Appl. No. 10/601,476
Response to Office Action of November 3, 2005
Page 8

REMARKS

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sluetz et al. (Re. No. 31,990). Claims 10 and 11 have been cancelled. Claim 1 has been amended to more specifically set forth the novel and nonobvious structure of the medical system of the present invention.

Sluetz discloses an implantable pulse generator having a header for connecting to a lead having a plurality of distal ring-shaped electrodes (i.e., tip electrode 68 and ground electrode 69) displaced from one another along the length of the lead body 66. Sluetz teaches to reverse the polarity of the distal electrodes by axially repositioning the proximal end of the lead body within the header.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to more specifically set forth the structural features of the claimed subject matter. As set forth in amended claim 1, a plurality of adjacent electrodes is distributed on an exterior surface of the lead body in a circumferential array. This is in contrast to Sluetz, which shows the two ring-shaped distal electrodes 68 and 69 being separated from one another and located along the length of the lead body 66. Further, amended claim 1 specifies that axial positioning of the lead body connector within the header connector bore serves to make an electrical connection between a lead body connector contact and a header connector bore contact so as to select an electrode of the circumferential array as a selected electrode. This is in contrast to the teaching of Sluetz wherein axial positioning does not change the selection of the electrodes (both remain selected), but instead serves merely to change the polarity of the electrodes.

Applicant submits that amended claim 1 and dependent claims 2, 5 and 9 distinguish over Sluetz. As such, the anticipation rejection is obviated and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/601,476
Response to Office Action of November 3, 2005
Page 9

II. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sluetz in combination with various other references. In each case, Sluetz was relied upon as the primary reference and it was applied in the same manner as it was applied in the rejection of claim 1 for anticipation. In view of the distinctions presented by amended claim 1 over Sluetz, Applicant submits that continued rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 8 as being obvious is clearly without basis.

III. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. A prompt issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 26, 2006
Date

Michael C. Soldner
Michael C. Soldner
Reg. No. 41,455
(763) 514-4842
Customer No. 27581